

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/518,495 03/03/00 WALKER J 3553-4044US2

┌

TM02/0425

└

EXAMINER

WALTER G HANCHUK
MORGAN & FINNEGAN LLP
345 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10154

NGUYEN, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

DATE MAILED:

04/25/01

[Handwritten mark]

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/518,495	WALKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie K. Nguyen	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 144-289 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 144-289 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. Claims 144-289 have been examined and are pending in the application.
2. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior copending Application No. 09/238,546, and filed 28 January 1999. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence of the specification of this application if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120. See 37 CFR 1.78(a). Also, the current status of all nonprovisional parent applications referenced should be included.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 144-289 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. in U.S. Pat. No. 6,041,308.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of

invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

As per claim 144, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device having embodied therein information relating to a plurality of airline flights (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for an airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5 and 6);
 - examine a plurality of flights to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5 and 6); and
 - select one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5 and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 145, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 144 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 146, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 144 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 147, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 144 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 148, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 144 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 149, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 144 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 150, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 144 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 151, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:

- receive a booking of an airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- query a central reservation system containing information regarding a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- selecting one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 152, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 151 as addressed above.

Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 153, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 151 as addressed above.

Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 154, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 151 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2166

to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 155, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 151 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 156, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 151 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 157, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 151 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the

customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 158, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device having embodied therein information relating to a plurality of airline flights (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for an airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
 - examine a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
 - select one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 159, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 158 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that

Art Unit: 2166

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 160, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 158 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 161, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 158 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 162, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 158 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known

teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 163, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for an airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not disclose the steps of relaying the booking to an airline carrier and providing notice of the booking to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that the invention relay the booking to an airline carrier so that the seat(s) on the plane is actually reserved for the traveler(s), thus, preventing the voiding of a contract between the traveler(s) and the provider. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 164, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 163 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 165, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 163 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 166, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 163 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 167, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 163 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known

teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 168, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for an airline ticket to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
 - query a central reservation system containing information regarding a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
 - selecting one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 169, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 168 as addressed above.
Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 170, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 168 as addressed above.
Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 171, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 168 as addressed above.
Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 172, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 168 as addressed above.
Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 173, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 168 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 174, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device having embodied therein information relating to a plurality of airline flights (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for a concealed carrier airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
 - examine a plurality of flights to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
 - select one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of

the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 175, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 174 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 176, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 174 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 177, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 174 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 178, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 174 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 179, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 174 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and

- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 180, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 174 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 181, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for a concealed carrier airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);

- query a central reservation system containing information regarding a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- select one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 182, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 181 as addressed above.

Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 183, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 181 as addressed above.

Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 184, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 181 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 185, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 181 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 186, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 181 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 187, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 181 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

Art Unit: 2166

As per claim 188, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device having embodied therein information relating to a plurality of airline flights (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for a concealed carrier airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
 - examine a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
 - select one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 189, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 188 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 190, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 188 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 191, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 188 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 192, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 188 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 193, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for a concealed carrier airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of relaying the booking to an airline carrier and thereafter providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it is inherent that the invention relay the booking to an airline carrier so that the seat(s) on the plane is actually reserved for the traveler(s), thus, preventing the voiding of a contract between the traveler(s) and the provider. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 194, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 193 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 195, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 193 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 196, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 193 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 197, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 193 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 198, Walker et al. disclose a system comprising:

- a memory device (FIG. 2);
- a processor in communication with the memory device (FIG. 2), the processor configured to:
 - receive a booking for a concealed carrier airline ticket to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
 - query a central reservation system containing information regarding a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the request (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
 - select one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 199, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 198 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 200, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 198 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 201, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 198 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 202, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 198 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

Claims 203-205 claim the method necessary to implement the system claimed in claims 198-202. Claims 203-205 are rejected upon the same grounds as claims 198-202.

Claims 206-211 claim the method necessary to implement the system claimed in claims 193-197. Claims 206-211 are rejected upon the same grounds as claims 193-197.

As per claim 212, Walker et al. disclose a method for using a computer to process the sale of travel services comprising:

- receiving a booking for a discount fare airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- examining a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- selecting one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 213, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 212 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 214, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 212 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The

following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 215, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 212 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 216, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 212 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 217, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 212 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 218, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 212 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 219, Walker et al. disclose a method for using a computer to process the sale of travel service comprising:

- receiving a booking for an airline ticket to a specified destination location from a specified departure location at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- querying a central reservation system containing information regarding a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the request (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- selecting one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler

must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 220, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 219 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 221, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 219 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 222, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 219 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 223, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 219 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 224, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 219 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

Art Unit: 2166

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 225, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 219 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 226, Walker et al. disclose a method for using a computer to process the sale of travel services comprising:

- receiving a booking for an airline ticket to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- examining a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- selecting one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 227, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 226 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 228, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 226 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 229, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 226 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 230, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 226 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 231, Walker et al. disclose a system for using a computer to process the sale of travel services comprising:

- receiving a booking for an airline ticket to a specified destination location from a specified departure location within a specified time range at a discount fare associated with the airline ticket, the booking not specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- querying a central reservations system containing information regarding a plurality of flights which would satisfy the booking to determine which of the plurality of flights to select for the booking (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- selecting one of the plurality of flights (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not teach the step of providing notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide notice of the selected flight to the traveler, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 232, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 231 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 233, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 231 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 234, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 231 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 235, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 231 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 238, Walker et al. disclose a method of selling discount fare airline tickets without undermining a published fare structure, comprising;

- establishing an acceptable discount fare for airline carriage to a specified destination location from a specified departure location (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- making the discount fare for airline carriage available to potential travelers without revealing the identity of an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- receiving a booking of the discount fare for airline carriage (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not disclose the step of outputting notice of an actual flight, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to output notice of an actual flight,

Art Unit: 2166

wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 239, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 238 as addressed above.

Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 240, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 238 as addressed above.

Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 241, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 238 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 242, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 238 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 243, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 238 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 244, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 238 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 245, Walker et al. disclose a method of selling discount fare airline tickets without undermining a published fare structure, comprising:

- establishing an acceptable discount fare for airline carriage to a specified destination from a specified departure location (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- making the discount fare for airline carriage available to potential travelers without revealing airline carrier identity or departure time (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- receiving a booking of the discount fare for airline carriage (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not disclose the step of outputting notice of an actual flight, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier and departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to output notice of an actual flight, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier and departure time. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier and departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 246, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 245 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 247, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 245 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 248, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 245 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 249, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 245 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 250, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 245 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 251, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 245 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 252, Walker et al. disclose a method of selling discount fare airline tickets without undermining a published fare structure, comprising:

- establishing an acceptable discount fare for airline carriage to a specified destination location from a specified departure location on a specified date (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6);
- making the discount fare for airline carriage available to potential travelers without revealing airline carrier identity or departure time (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and
- receiving a booking of the discount fare for airline carriage (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not disclose the step of outputting notice of an actual flight, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier and departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to output notice of an actual flight, wherein the notice identifies the airline carrier and departure time. The traveler must be provided the airline carrier and departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 253, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 252 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking does not specify a departure time (FIG. 5 and 6).

As per claim 254, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 252 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the booking specifies a departure time range (FIG. 5 and 6). The following is an example of the Examiner's interpretation of "departure time range": 12:00 AM 01/15/99 through 11:59 PM 02/22/99.

As per claim 255, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 252 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the flight number. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the flight number in the notice. The traveler must be provided the flight number in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 256, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 252 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the notice identifies the departure time. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the departure time in the notice. The traveler must be provided the departure time in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 257, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 252 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 258, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 252 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 259, Walker et al. disclose a method comprising:

- receiving an offer to purchase an unspecified carrier airline ticket for a traveler to a specified destination location from a specified departure location on a specified date within a specified time range at a traveler specified price, the offer not yet specifying an airline carrier (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6); and

- booking an airline ticket that satisfies the offer (FIG. 2, 3, 5, and 6).

Walker et al. do not disclose the step of outputting notice to the traveler of the actual flight information, including flight number, departure time, and airline. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to output notice to the traveler of the actual flight information, including flight number, departure time, and airline. The traveler must be provided the flight number, departure time, and airline in the notice in order to go to the proper gate at the proper time to board the proper flight.

As per claim 260, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 259 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to:

- issue a voucher for the booking; and
- transmit the voucher to the traveler.

The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue a voucher for a booking and transmit the voucher to the traveler (similar to Airhitch method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since travelers are provided with a hard copy redemption method.

As per claim 261, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 259 as addressed above.

Walker et al. do not teach that the processor is further configured to issue an e-ticket for the booking. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to issue an e-ticket to a customer after the customer has booked a flight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since the

customer is provided with a quick and commonly utilized means for checking-in prior to boarding an airplane.

As per claim 262, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 259 as addressed above. Walker et al. further teach that the offer is received through an online connection (FIG. 1).

As per claim 263, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 259 as addressed above. Walker et al. do not teach that the offer is received via an interactive voice response unit. The Examiner takes Official Notice and asserts that it is well known to use interactive voice response units to make and receive purchase offers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this well-known teaching into the invention of Walker et al. The invention of Walker et al. is enhanced since an automated method for purchasing may be used by the traveler regardless of the traveler's location.

As per claim 264, Walker et al. disclose the system of claim 259 as addressed above. Walker et al. further disclose that the offer is guaranteed by a financial account (col. 1, lines 45-47; col. 5, lines 60-62; and col. 9, lines 33-35).

Claims 265-270 claim the system necessary to implement the method claims 259-264 and are rejected upon the same grounds as method claims 259-264.

Claims 271-277 claim the method necessary to implement the system claimed in claims 144-150. Claims 271-277 are rejected upon the same grounds as claims 144-150.

Claims 278-284 claim the method necessary to implement the system claimed in claims 151-157. Claims 278-284 are rejected upon the same grounds as claims 151-157.

Claims 285-289 claim the method necessary to implement the system claimed in claims 158-162. Claims 285-289 are rejected upon the same grounds as claims 158-162.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Ahlstrom et al. teach a computer reservation system with means to rank travel itineraries chosen in terms of schedule/fare data.
- Schoolery et al. teach a corporate travel controller.
- Hunt et al. teach a method and apparatus for interacting with a computer reservation system.
- Walker et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,794,207) teach the method and apparatus for a cryptographically assisted commercial network system designed to facilitate buyer-driven conditional purchase offers.
- Hammarström et al. teach the method and apparatus for integrating intelligent network services with operator assisted services.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie K. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-306-5540. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00 AM - 6:30 PM EDT.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-9051 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2166

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Leslie K. Nguyen
April 20, 2001



TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100